

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 48.—No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1823. [Price 1s.

TO

MR. WILBERFORCE.

On his Pamphlet, entitled, "*An Appeal to the Religion, Justice and Humanity of the Inhabitants of the British Empire, in behalf of the Negro Slaves in the West Indies.*"

Kensington, Dec. 10th, 1823.

SIR,

You conclude the above-mentioned Pamphlet with expressing your expectation that "*the grossest and most unfounded calumnies will be poured out against*" you. This shows, that you do not rightly understand what *calumny* means. If the charge be *founded*, it cannot be *calumny*; and, as to a thing being *most unfounded*, that is sheer nonsense. I shall certainly not pour out *calumny* upon you, though so strongly pressed by your example; but, I shall, I think, prove you to be what a very large part

of persons of sense have long thought; namely, a very crafty, a very insincere, and a very malignant and mischievous man. In fact, what I am about to do is, to defend a pretty numerous body of our fellow subjects against your *calumnies*. I am aware, that you, in your quality of *Saint*, may claim a right to becall and to blackguard, as much as you please, any portion of the rest of mankind; but, though the leaders of mean and corrupt factions may submit to this claim, I shall protest against it; and shall treat you as if you were no *Saint* at all.

The object, which you profess to have in view, is, to rouse the people of this country, which, in the pompous slang of the newspapers and of Saint Stephen's, you call an "*Empire*;" your object is, to rouse the people of this country to use their influence with the Government and Legislature in order to make the **BLACKS** in the *West Indies* **FREE**; and this, too, without suffering the **WHITES** in the

X



West Indies to have any thing to do with the matter, either by themselves, or by their legislative assemblies. Your pamphlet is a heap of confused matter. You distinctly state no object; you clearly describe none of your means; you do not say exactly *when*, or *how*, you would free the the Blacks; you talk about *preparatory* steps, but never *define* them. What are we to gather from, "all lawful and constitutional means to mitigate, and, as soon as it may be safely done, to terminate, the Negro Slavery of the British Colonies!"

What a fine latitude for interpretation! POOR ORACLE, with all his profits from watching the "turn of the market," could not keep off the old fellow with his hour-glass; and, so, poor ORACLE is dead as a door nail! If he were alive, you might defy him to beat this. I wonder what "all constitutional means are." What do you mean by "constitutional"? You cannot tell us; and yet this word has, for years and years past, been everlastingly upon your lips, and upon the lips of all your fellow workers. Nobody talked more about the *constetushon* than old loyalty-loan Dundas. Bawling Pitt never bawled so loudly as when he was bawling about the *constitution*, and he never bawled about the constitution so much as when he and you and the rest of you were proposing and passing Acts to authorize him and Dundas and their associates to shut Englishmen up in any of the gaols without any charge preferred against them, and to keep them so shut up as long as they pleased, without ever bringing them to trial. I know you will

say, "These were nothing but WHITES." That is true; but, that does not alter the fact; and I am only adverting to the fact, that the words, *constitution* and *constitutional*, have been constantly used most when mischief was most actively on foot.

"All constitutional means" are to be used. I remember how you lauded that constitutional measure, the Bank Stoppage Act, of those who, in Committee, recommended which, you were one. Nothing was so constitutional as Sidmouth's Power-of-Imprisonment Bill, or, as his Circular about the press. However, I shall, perhaps, have to speak of other "constitutional means" by-and-by. At present, I shall only further observe upon this epithet, that it means *any thing*, or *nothing*, just as the writer, or the reader, pleases. But, then, the slavery is to be mitigated, and, as soon as it can be done safely, to be put an end to. You do not, in any part of your pamphlet, lay down any plan of mitigation; you do not show, nor attempt to show, that such mitigation can take place without manifest danger to the Whites. You acknowledge, that there may be danger; for, you talk about giving the freedom as soon as it can be safely done. If you cannot safely give freedom now, how do you know that you can ever do it with safety? And, how can you safely set about the work of mitigation?

I dissent entirely from your propositions. I am of opinion, not only that slavery cannot be abolished, but that it cannot be other than it is now, without the overthrow of the colonies; that is to say, without the destruction of



the Whites, and the total loss of the colonies to this country. And, indeed, you seem to be aware of this last consequence; for, in one place, you cry up the liberal policy of abandoning the navigation laws, and talk about the "folly" of supposing, that a nation gains by the depression of its neighbours. However, this is a question, which you ought to have put fairly and fully to those to whom you were addressing yourself. You ought to have told them, that they must, if they listened to you, be prepared for seeing Jamaica what French St. Domingo now is; that is to say, nine-tenths destroyed, and the benefit of the other tenth given chiefly to our maritime rival, the United States. Your "liberal policy" would scorn, I dare say, to think about such a trifling advantage to the United States, though they take care to preserve their slave system. You have found out, that "every nation is benefited by the growing affluence of others; and that all are thus interested in the well being and improvement of all!" Mad, ranting devils; to what a pitch will your ravings go at last!

But, again, I say, why did not you put this plainly to your readers? Why did you not tell them, that you would see the island of Jamaica, what French St. Domingo now is, rather than give up your project? Why did you not say, in distinct terms, that you cared less for the preservation of the colonies than for the gratification of your meddling and mischievous ambition? You say, that, "taking in all considerations of political economy, and looking to the lamentable waste of human life amongst our soldiers and

seamen, raised at a great expense, as well as to the more direct pecuniary charge of protecting the sugar colonies, no system of civil polity was ever maintained at a greater price, or was less truly profitable, either to individuals or to the community, than our West India Settlements." This slips out slyly, and is not noticed by every reader, but it clearly shows, that, like "friend CROPPER," that sublime piece of cant and of humbug, you are, at bottom, for the overthrow of the colonies. This is no crime in you; but, then, you should have said it plainly; and not have gone on to almost the end of the pamphlet, pretending to be a friend of the West India planters and merchants.

It might easily be shown, that these colonies are almost the only ones that are really valuable to us; and, as to their being expensive, it is the mother country, which is, by the swarms of place-men and pensioners that she loads them with, and by the taxes and restrictions which she imposes on their produce, expensive to them. Will the mother country consent to their transferring of their allegiance to the United States, or to France? Why not, if they be a burden? The bare putting of the question rouses an Englishman's blood. Yet, why not do this at once, if what you say be true? Why not do this, rather than torment ourselves with everlasting disputes concerning this Negro slavery? It is near the close of your pamphlet, that you thus speak of the expenses occasioned by these colonies. You seem to have read over the previous part, and to have perceived,

that, after all, your project could come to nothing without a *St. Domingo* termination. Then, despairing of showing the contrary of this, you find out, that the *possession* of the colonies is *an evil* rather than a good!

To those (if there be such) who think with you as to this point, I have nothing to say; for, if we ought to desire to *get rid* of the colonies, your efforts are most laudable; but, to those who think with me, that to keep these colonies, and in a state of tranquillity too, is, and especially at this time, an object of the greatest importance; to those who think, that we cannot lose these colonies without adding greatly to the strength of the United States; to those who duly consider the increasing force of the United States, the close connexion between those States and Russia and France; to such persons I have a great deal to say.

I have already observed, that you talk of *preparatory measures*, but never *define* them. You talk of *raising* the Negroes from their state of *depression*; you talk of *elevating* them, if they be not yet fit "for the enjoyment of *British freedom*;" you talk of *giving* them an interest in defending the community to which they belong. We shall see, perhaps, by-and-by, what interest of this kind has been left to the labourers who "enjoy *British freedom*." But, after all this talk; all this talk about *raising* and *elevating*, you say nothing *definite*. You do not *name* the things you would have done. If you had said, that you would make all free in such a time; that you would make all free of such an age; that you would do *this* or

*that*: then we should have known what you meant. But, it was not your intention to be explicit. This did not suit your purpose. You, therefore, talk of *all* lawful and constitutional means, but never *name* any of those means. You wish to *mitigate*, and finally *put an end to*, the slavery; yet, this is to be done only as soon as it can be *safely* done. But, in the very sentence in which you acknowledge, that *time* and *caution* are necessary, you begin your foul attacks on the colonists; you begin to give them that character, which, if it were just, would deprive them of all compassion, though the Negroes were to leave not a man of them alive.

Instead of proving, or attempting to prove, that the state of the Blacks can be changed without imminent danger to the Whites, and *without producing more suffering than is produced by the present system*; instead of attempting any thing of this kind, you set to work to *abuse*, to *calumniate*, the White people and the Legislatures of the West Indies. You have not closed the sentence, in which you talk about doing the thing *safely*; you have not closed the sentence, before you call the system one of the "*grossest injustice* and *most heathenish irreligion*." The epithets *barbarous*, *cruel*, *savage*, *remorseless*, *brutal*, and the term *ruffian*, are applied to the planters, and, indeed, to the Whites in general, without the smallest apology or ceremony. The thing you *drive at* is, to get an Act of Parliament passed to take the power out of the hands of the *Colonial Assemblies*. This is the great point at which you aim; because, unless you can do



that, you cannot easily effect your purpose.

In order to carry this point, which is, perhaps, to be attempted when the Lord Johns meet, you represent the Assemblies *as unfit to make laws relative to the Blacks*; and you make the most *exaggerated statements relative to the treatment of the latter*. I shall now examine what you say as to these matters.

As to the first, you say, that the Colonial Assemblies do not possess an *exclusive* jurisdiction as to these subjects, as a *right*. What is meant by *exclusive*? If they have not the *sole* right, they have *no right at all*, and they may at once give the matter up to you and the rest of the great and wise House, who passed Peel's Bill *to make cash come*, and then the Small Note Bill *to keep cash away*, and who declared both to be *expedient*. You here for a second time appeal to the authority of DUNDAS and of BURKE. They never seemed to allow of any such right in the Assemblies. What is that to us? What *argument* is it in your favour? DUNDAS was, indeed, acquitted *by the House of Lords*; but, it is, nevertheless, true, that it was discovered and proved, that the ten thousand pounds which he subscribed to the *loyalty-loan*, he *took out of the public money*! Burke, indeed, understood *something* of West India affairs, of which we have a pretty good proof in his having discovered the *Leeward Island Fund*; that is to say, a tax on those islands, out of which tax he contrived to get three thousand pounds a-year while living, and *two thousand five hundred pounds a-year ever since he has been*

*dead*! These men are pretty authorities to appeal to! Perhaps two men more completely destitute of all public principle never existed in any country in the world.

Whence does the *unfitness* arise? You are very much hampered in providing an answer to this question. You say, that, "to persons not conversant with the state of things in the West Indies, it may appear *plausible* to say, that the Assemblies and their constituents are the most competent, in point of information, to the important work of *reform*; and many are apt to be misled by a *supposed analogy* between the relations of master and slave in the West Indies, and those of *the owner and occupier of land and his labourers in this country*." Ah! now; and what do you say to this? Why, you *assert* that there is no such analogy; and then you quote Mr. BROUGHAM for a description of the *speculating and adventuring and gambling* character of the West India landholders, what he says being mere *assertion* too. It is you, however, and not Mr. BROUGHAM, who tells us, that the West India proprietorship "gives none of those steady local attachments, which belong to the landed proprietor here, and make him the *natural patron of the labouring class, settled on his hereditary property*." Ah! you push hard to make it out, that the boroughmongers have a right to make laws *for us*; but that the West India proprietors (all the freeholders) have not a right to make laws *for the Blacks*! But, let us try this a little.

The principle on which you

proceed is this; that the Assemblies are *unfit* to make laws for the Blacks, because none but Whites sit in, or vote for members of, the Assemblies. Now, can you make shift to twist in such a way as to find out a justification for your having opposed radical reform in England? If the Assemblies be, on this ground, unfit to make laws for the Blacks, is the present Parliament fit to make laws for the people of this country? Oh! but our landowners are the "*natural patrons of the labouring classes*." Indeed! And, how come they, then, to cram the gaols so very full of them for their endeavouring to get a small share of those wild animals, which God has given to all? It is notorious, that about a third part of all the prisoners in each gaol consists of men put into the gaols for being in pursuit of, or for taking, hares, pheasants and partridges. God has given these to *all men*. They are not the property of any particular persons. They cannot be identified, or detained in any particular spot. Yet the gaols are filled with poor men, because these, driven by hunger, wish to have a small share of these wild animals. The laws which sanction this imprisonment are passed by those who, for the most part, own the land. And yet you do not think these unfit to make laws to bind the labouring classes; but, on the contrary, you call them the "*natural patrons*" of the labourers!

Another reason which you give for not leaving the Blacks to the Colonial Assemblies, is, that it is the interest of the Whites to keep the Blacks in their present state. You deny that it is, but say that

they think it their interest. And, did you ever yet hear of any King, aristocracy, or any body of great or rich persons, who did not think it their *interest* to keep the upper hand? You all along pretend, that what you propose would be for the *good of the Whites*; and this is just what WILLIAM LAMB said of us Reformers, when he was supporting Sidmouth's Power-of-Imprisonment Bill! Well; let the Whites judge for themselves, then. Surely the Assembly in Jamaica is as likely to know its *own interests* as you or Mr. BUXTON or Mrs. FRY.

In several instances you bid us look at the *United States*; you hold them out as an *example*. Let us see, then, how this example bears you out. In that country, there are, as to every State, *two governments*; one which has authority to a certain extent over all the states; and one which has authority within the state only. The CONGRESS is, to the State Governments, pretty much what the Government here is to those in the Colonies. America is a "*fine free country*;" but, the slave states will no more suffer the Congress, to meddle with their internal laws and regulations, than they will suffer it to put chains upon the limbs of the farmers and planters. Nay, the Constitution of the United States *forbids the Congress to meddle in this very question*, while it provides, that slave states shall have, in their proportion of representatives in Congress, an allowance for the Blacks. That is, each state being allotted representatives in number proportioned to its population, each slave state has a certain number of representatives on ac-



*count of its Blacks*, over and above those to whom it is entitled by its White population. So that, in fact, the whole of the United States are governed by men, a part of whom sit in the Congress as the representatives, not of the slaves, but of the *propriatorship* in slaves. They are the representatives of *slavery*, and of *nothing else*! Yet, you cite the *example* of the United States!

This is in the *Congress*, observe, where the members, who sit in virtue of property in slaves, assist to make laws which affect the whole of the States. Nor is it a thing to be overlooked, that of the **FIVE PRESIDENTS**, which the people of America have had to choose, they have chosen **FOUR** from a *slave state*, all of them born and bred in a *slave state*, and all of them *great slave-owners*, during their *Presidentship* as well as before! And yet, you would have this credulous nation, this cant-cajoled nation believe, that the West India Assemblies are *not to be trusted* with the making of laws affecting the Blacks, because they are composed of men, who have lived in a country where the Blacks are held in slavery, and because, they have, and must have, those feelings of contempt for, and all those prejudices relative to, the Blacks, which are entertained by all the Whites that live amongst them. Was not **WASHINGTON**, and were not **JEFFERSON**, **MADISON** and **MONROE** as liable to this objection? Yet, the people of the United States, so jealous of their liberty, chose these men as the depositaries of the greatest degree of power existing in the country. And, they chose them, too, in *preference* to

others, who were not born and bred in a slave state, and who had never been slave-owners. Mark, moreover, that **MR. ADAMS**, the only President not from a slave state, was *put out of his office at the end of four years*, and that each of the others was kept in his office for *eight years*. So that, the United States, out of their *thirty-six years* of Republican Government, have been *thirty-two years* under chief magistrates who were slave-holders; and have *chosen* to be thus; have rejected men, who were not slave-holders, in order to have the slave-holders. These chief magistrates have (and without boroughmonger control), the power of life and death as to condemned criminals; they have the nomination of ambassadors and other high officers; they are entrusted with the appointment of naval and military officers; they carry on negotiations with foreign powers, and they make treaties subject to ratification or rejection by the Senate; they are entrusted with the expenditure of a large part of the taxes; and they have an *absolute veto* as to all Acts passed by the Congress; for, though these Acts would become laws, if the two houses of Congress were to persevere, they never have yet so persevered, in a case where the President has exercised his veto.

So that, according to your notion, according to that which you would infuse into the minds of the people of England, the people of the United States must be the most base, stupid, perverse and self-degraded wretches that ever were seen upon the face of the earth. If a man, born and bred

in a slave state; if a man who has never had any property that did not depend upon upholding a system of slavery; if such a man be unfit to partake in the making of laws, affecting merely his own individual state or colony; what a figure do the people of the United States make, who choose precisely such a man, and invest him with the power of preventing acts of the Congress from becoming laws?

You tell your readers, that it is necessary for you to dwell particularly upon this point; that it is necessary for you to insist with particular stress on the unfitness of the assemblies to pass the necessary laws. You will not, therefore, complain if I dwell, even longer than necessary, upon this same point. You complain, that the Colonial House of Assembly is chosen by the "*resident White proprietors at large*"; and that it must necessarily be governed, in "a great measure by their general sentiments and feelings." Well! and what then? Is not this the proper and just source of government? You proceed, however, to observe, that the Assembly, "cannot be supposed to be influenced by what is here (in England) called the popular voice, but which, in the West Indies, is the *voice of the White colonists only*, and these, too, of the *lower order*, among whom the *esprit de corps* is peculiarly strong."

This is, indeed, a curious specimen of political hypocrisy; but, withal, one of the poorest shuffles that crafty canter ever resorted to. You were aware, that we should say that a choosing by the resident White population at large was a

very good sort of choosing; that it was a great deal better than the choosings of Old Sarum, of Gatton, and of the precious borough of *Bramber*: you were aware that we should say this; and that we should sigh for such a change here as would put us upon a level with the people of Jamaica, taking blacks and whites altogether: you were well aware that the boroughmongers dare not give their consent to a choosing by a voice of the *resident proprietors at large*; freehold, copyhold and leasehold: you were well aware of this; and you well knew that you could impute no seat-selling to the people in power in Jamaica: in short, you were well aware, that as *representatives*, there was no comparison between the Members of the Assemblies of the Colonies, and the Members of that House of Commons, to which you wish to transfer the powers, which of right belong only to those Assemblies. Aware of these things, you endeavour to bolster yourself up by affecting to believe that the House of Commons is *influenced by the popular voice*; but that there is no such voice to influence the Assemblies in the West Indies; or, at any rate, if there be such voice, it is the voice of the Whites only, and, therefore, a mischievous voice. This creates in one's mind a strange confusion of ideas; but let me try to make one point clear at any rate. You clearly would have us understand, that the Assembly would be a better thing, and more fit to be trusted with the making of laws to govern the Blacks, if it were influenced by what is here called the "*popular voice*." This influence of the



popular voice upon a body of men chosen, not only without that voice, but, in most instances, in despite of it, is one of the impudent pretences that Corruption has hatched and brought forth in England. The language of Corruption is this: You do not, indeed, *vote* for Members of Parliament; not a thousandth part of you vote; but you are *virtually* represented; and you have, besides, always working for you the influence of the popular voice. This is what Corruption tells us; and this, in substance, you now repeat. The popular voice, you say, has not its weight in the West Indies, as it has here.

I am going to hit you hard now, and, therefore, give you warning. The popular voice is here represented by you as a thing which *ought to have an influence* on the Assemblies in the West Indies; and because those Assemblies are not under the influence of such popular voice as exists here; those Assemblies not being under the influence of such popular voice, is one of the reasons why they are unfit to have power to make laws to affect that part of the labouring class who have no votes. Now, mark: in the year 1819, a motion was made in the House of Commons, for the House to inquire into the conduct of those who had killed, or had caused to be killed, and wounded, or caused to be wounded, about five hundred, of the labouring classes in England. Mind, the motion was simply for *inquiry* into the matter. You, as the printed Report says, objected to that inquiry; and it states, also, that one ground of your objecting to it was, that it would be,

“YIELDING TO THE CLAMOUR OUT OF DOORS”!

Let that speak for itself. I find fault of nothing that you have done *in the House of Commons*; but until you can conjure up a distinction, and a pretty clear one too, between “*the popular voice*,” and “*the clamour out of doors*,” until you can conjure up something to make us believe that there is a difference between these two things, I shall consider this passage of your pamphlet as a choice specimen of hypocrisy.

The idea of an assembly being the better for being *influenced* by those, by whom it has not been *chosen* is despicable: it is contemptible and ridiculous. Surely it is better to let all those who are to have an influence on the assembly, assist in *choosing* the assembly; but, the fact which you would here make us believe to be true is false. The mass of the people in England have no influence whatever on the assembly at St. Stephen's. That assembly does what it pleases. It makes laws to make us pay *Sunday tolls*: it compels the man with the *ass-cart* to pay as much toll as the lord in his gig. It does what it pleases: and, as we have just seen, as to the popular voice, that is called *clamour*. Your argument, then, against the Colonial Assemblies is a much more powerful argument against the body to which you would transfer the power; and to which, be it observed, you, yourself, belong. Indeed, your argument carried to its natural extent, would prohibit the landowners, that is to say, the *masters*, to have any thing to do with the making of laws in any country. You are more of a democrat than

any one I ever heard of before: for, according to you, the laws affecting the labouring classes in every country, must be made by somebody, *not resident in that country*; and thus, we may make an exchange; the Parliament here may make laws affecting the Negroes, and the Colonial Assemblies make laws affecting the labourers in England. The thing is not very likely to take place; but, if you can bring it about, I can only say, that you shall have my hearty concurrence.

What ground, then, do you find to rest on, in your proposition to take from the Assemblies the right of making laws affecting the Negroes? Every argument that you produce, turns out to be an argument against yourself; and yet, unless you succeed in this point, your slanders on the colonists will be wholly unavailing. The example of the United States is complete in all its parts. That is not a country of slavish notions; that is not a country where the labouring classes are ill used; that is not a country where it is fashionable to despise the low and to cringe to the lofty: it is a country of real freedom, with the exception of that state of slavery which exists, with regard to the Blacks. If the thing were so monstrous as you represent it, if it were a mass of such cruelties and such horrors, could it possibly be tolerated in that country; and if the existence of the Black slavery engendered that tyranny and cruelty of disposition in the Whites, and rendered these Whites so unfit for the labours of legislation, is it to be believed that the humane, the hospitable, the kind, the gentle people of America,

who, in these respects, are surpassed by no people in the world: is it to be believed that this people would have, almost exclusively, chosen their Presidents from amongst the slave-holders, if to be a slave-holder inferred tyranny and cruelty of disposition?

In order to make out your case, as the lawyers call it, against the Assemblies, you descant largely, *on the treatment of the Blacks*. I am a good deal at your mercy here; because, in most instances, you produce nothing in the way of proof of your assertions. It seems impossible, that the Blacks should not have been exterminated long ago, if what you say be true. There must be great exaggeration; but if your statement were true, to the full extent, I should say, that you, especially as a Member of Parliament, ought not to move a step towards changing things in the West Indies, until things have been completely changed at home. My firm belief is, that the Negroes in our West India Colonies are, on the average, better fed, more comfortably situated, and lead easier and happier lives, than the labourers of this kingdom; and, though, as a subject of the King, I have a right to turn my attention to the West India Colonies; I have a right to talk about them and to write about them; but I have, morally speaking, no right to spend any portion of my time in endeavours to mend the lot of the slaves, as long as I am convinced that a large portion of my own countrymen are worse off than those slaves.

You appear to be well aware of this sort of objection to your



interference, and, therefore, you lay great stress upon the benefits of *Christianity*, of which I will speak more by-and-by. You observe that the West Indians, in the *warmth of argument*, have told us that the Negro slaves, are "as well or better off, than our British peasantry." British peasantry, in your teeth, canting pamphleteer! Where did you learn to call Englishmen *peasantry*? What high fed son or daughter of corruption furnished you with that word? In the vocabulary of what boroughmonger did you find it? Peasant means a wretched White slave; and the bare use of the word by you, shows that the West Indians were right when they said that their slaves were as well or better off, than the labourers in this country.

How are we to try the question? By what are we to judge? Is it by the relative feeding, clothing, lodging, and labour? I say, *Yes*. But this you decline! You will "not condescend to argue this question on any such grounds." These, however, are the grounds, on which every man of sense will argue the question. It may suit you, as it did George Rose, to set a higher value upon religion, or rather, upon what you call religion, than upon food and raiment; but I fancy ninety-nine out of every hundred persons, when the question is whether the labourer be well or ill off; will first ask, *How is he fed?* This is, indeed, the great matter; for what is life unless there be a sufficiency of food to prevent the body from being wasted by want? Yet, you will not argue the question on this ground! You will not "condescend" to think any thing

about the relative quantity of food of the parties. Now, I deem this the first thing of all; and I am certain that no sincere man that knows any thing of the situation of the parties will deny, that a West India slave has twice as much wholesome sustenance, as is received, on an average, by an English labourer arrived at man's estate; and that he has this, too, for performing about a tenth part of the labour performed, upon an average, by an English labourer.

I wish you had gone into some detail; into some *comparison*, in this respect, between the treatment of our own White labourers and the labourers in the West Indies. If you had done this, you would have been committed to certain facts, which you now are not. However, let me ask you a few questions: Did you ever know Negroes in the West Indies fed upon so little as a *pound and a quarter of bread per day*, as the poor creatures in the Hundreds of Clavering and Loddon in Norfolk now are? Did you ever hear the Judges from the Bench in the West Indies describe, as the Judges here did the other day, the food of the labouring people to be bread or oatmeal? Did you ever know the Blacks in the West Indies to live in so wretched a manner as that of the Irish people, as described in Reports laid before the House of Commons? Did you, in short, ever know that hundreds and thousands of Blacks in the West Indies were *starved to death*? This last you *know* to have been the case in Ireland. You *know* that they were starving by thousands, while the ports of Ireland were crowded with ships, carrying away the meal and the corn!

None of my questions can you answer in the affirmative; and yet they can all be answered in the affirmative as applicable to this kingdom. To the last question, however, I wish to hold you a little longer; for, though I do not question the *right* of Mr. Galway MARTIN to come over to England to discover his *humanity* in protecting the horses and asses from unnecessary flogging; though I do not question his *right* to do this. I must confess that I question the correctness of his taste, as long as he and every body else sees going on in his own country, scenes like that at Skibbereen. He that can, unmoved see a human throat cut, and, the next minute swoon at the sight of a dying fly, may be a wonderfully sensitive person; but he is no man for me. If I were bent upon protecting the backs of English horses and asses, I would, if I were an Irishman, see an end to scenes like that of Skibbereen; and while millions of my wretched country people were perishing with hunger and cold, I would not go into another country in search of objects of compassion.

I stick, therefore, to my question: Did you ever know hundreds of West India Blacks to die for want of food? You will say that this has happened but *once* in Ireland. Deaths are continually taking place in all parts of the kingdom from want of food. The wretched man, woman, and three children at LODDON and CLAVERINO, sentenced to live on tenpence a day; these wretched beings must, necessarily, die by inches. But, allow there to have been but this *one instance* of starvation; still, can you find me one instance of such starvation amongst

the West India Blacks? And if you can find no such instance, are not the Blacks better off than the people of Ireland? It is not in the *warmth* of argument, as you call it; but in sober seriousness, that I say, that the Negro slaves are better off than the labourers of this country. You choose to overlook the grand article of food; but this is because you never were hungry. You never knew what it was to have less food than was necessary for you. No idea do you seem to have of the sufferings of those millions of poor creatures, who, in this kingdom, creep nightly to their miserable straw, tormented with hunger and with cold. The man who is well fed; that is to say, the mere labouring man, is seldom unhappy, his wants are very few. Food is the first and principal want. In the case of the Negro, clothing and lodging are matters of little moment; seeing that he can never suffer from cold; so that, in this case, the article of food is every thing, unless, indeed, you could show, that the Negroes were *overworked*; a thing which you have not even attempted.

Let us see, then, upon what ground it is that you resent and affect to be indignant, at this assertion of the West Indians, that these slaves are as well or better off than "our British peasantry." "A Briton to compare the state of a West Indian slave with that of an *English freeman*, and to give the former the preference! It is to imply an utter insensibility of the *native feelings and moral dignity* of man, no less than of the rights of *Englishmen!!*" Why not put *three marks of admiration*? one



of these is, however, I suppose, to represent *native feelings*, and the other, *moral dignity*. Why not talk about an *Irish* freeman, as well as an *English* freeman? But, I will proceed, and we will by-and-by see what this *English* freeman really is. "I will not condescend to argue this question, as I might, on the ground of comparative *feeding* and *clothing*, and *lodging*, and *medical attendance*. Are these the only claims? are these the chief privileges of a rational and immortal being? Is the consciousness of *personal independence* nothing? are *self-possession* and *self-government* nothing? Is it of no account that our *persons* are *inviolable* by any *private* authority, and that the whip is placed only in the hands of the *public executioner*? Is it of no value that we have the power of pursuing the *occupation* and the *habits of life which we prefer*; that we have the prospect, or at least the hope, of improving our condition, and of rising, as we have seen others rise, from poverty and obscurity, to comfort, and opulence, and distinction? Again, are all the *charities of the heart*, which arise out of the domestic relations, to be considered as nothing; and, I may add, all their security too among men who are free agents, and not vendible chattels, liable continually to be torn from their dearest connections, and sent into a perpetual exile? Are husband and wife, parent and child, terms of no meaning? Are willing services, or grateful returns for voluntary kindnesses,

nothing? But, above all, is *Christianity* so little esteemed among us, that we are to account as of no value the hope, 'full of immortality,' the light of heavenly truth, and all the consolations and supports by which religion cheers the hearts and elevates the principles, and dignifies the conduct of multitudes of our labouring classes in this free and enlightened country? Is it nothing to be taught that all human distinctions will soon be at an end; that all the labours and sorrows of poverty and hardship will soon exist no more; and to know, on the express authority of Scripture, that the lower classes, instead of being an inferior order in the creation, are even the preferable objects of the love of the Almighty!"

This was your grand push. You seem to chuckle, and to hug yourself in the thought of the execution that it would produce. "There," you seem to have said, "get that out of their soft heads, if you can." Let us take this firago, then, a bit at a time, and see what it is made of.

With heavenly food you would feed our labourer, abundantly; but as to the food of this present life, you leave him to get that as he can. The close of this passage, shows us, the length to which fanaticism or hypocrisy carries you, and what wild work it must be if the lives and properties of men are to be sported with in such a way. Unable to deny, that the West India slave is as well fed, and even better fed than the average of our own labourers, you resort to various other things of value, which, according to you,

our labourers possess, and which the West India Black does not possess. Now, in the first place, all that you say with regard to moral and religious enjoyments have little or no application to the case of the Black. He knows nothing of these enjoyments; he knows nothing of property or political rights, any more than does the cane that he cultivates. You harp exceedingly upon the relationships of husband and wife, of parent and child; but what gross misrepresentation it is to seem to take it for granted that these relationships ever did exist amongst these Blacks! Take, indeed, a man and woman (Blacks), who have been brought up amongst White people, and have contracted, in a great measure, their habits and way of thinking; take these people and treat them as the slaves in general are treated, and the cruelty would deserve any degree of punishment. It is unjust and cruel to separate those of the common slaves that are known to be much attached to each other. I would have no fellowship with a man that I knew to be guilty of such an act; but such acts will seldom be committed: the natural justice of the master would, generally, be against it, and if he were destitute of justice, his interest would be sufficient to restrain him; because it necessarily must be, that slaves, thus forcibly separated, become of less value, in consequence of the separation.

Your object is to draw the public away from the real truth, by speaking of the Blacks as subject to all the pains which English people would feel, if treated as the Blacks are. This is not the

way that those reason who provide punishments for poachers and trespassers. They do not, in providing those punishments, proceed upon the supposition that a hedger or a carter has all the feelings of a lord. Had you acted fairly you would have told your readers that these Blacks have no idea of "*independence*," of moral conduct, or of any of those things, the want of the enjoyment of which, you represent as such a hardship. It can be no hardship, it can be no cause of suffering, not to possess a thing of which one has never had an idea.

All these fine things, therefore, enumerated in the passage that I have just quoted, amount to nothing: they are not all worth one single mouthful of bread. A labourer with his belly full of good food, and without ever having heard of any of these, is a million times better off than one, who thinks he ought to possess them all, who possesses hardly any of them, and whose belly is not full. I think I hear you exclaim, "What! is Christianity so little esteemed amongst us, that we are to account as of no value, the hope full of immortality, the light of heavenly truth, and all the consolation and supports by which religion cheers the hearts, and elevates the principles and dignifies the conduct, of multitudes of our own labouring classes in this *free and enlightened* country!" Oh! yes, Christianity is of a great deal of value; and when you tell us what you mean by Christianity, I shall be ready to discuss any proposition for the teaching of it to the Blacks; but you never tell us what you mean by Christianity.



In the course of your pamphlet you are led, incidentally to state that that marriage, which you so much wish to see take place amongst the Blacks, has never been encouraged, and has never taken place, except amongst the Roman Catholic slaves. In another part of your pamphlet, you speak of the manumission of slaves by their masters "which has been provided for, with so much true humanity, by the laws in force in the Spanish Colonies." Why, then, do you talk to us of the Missionaries which have been sent out into our colonies? Why do you praise them, when it is notorious that they hold these Roman Catholics to be idolaters? There is no knowing what you mean by religion, and especially by religious truth. If these Roman Catholics preach truth, your Missionaries preach falsehood. Indeed no man can tell what you mean by the word religion or by the word Christianity. In this country there is misery enough arising from the rant and cant carried on by those bands of blackguards which prowl about the country, calling themselves Ministers of the Gospel. Even here, families are thrown into confusion by them; parents and children, husbands and wives are set to quarrelling. Innumerable are the instances in which insanity has proceeded from gloominess, engendered by the ravings of these crafty seekers after food and clothing produced by the labour of others. If such be the case here; if here amongst a people really enlightened, generally speaking, insanity, acts of suicide, and even acts of murder are

produced by the rantings of these men, what must be the consequence of their being suffered to work upon the minds of the Blacks? The Colonial Assemblies have many things, many dangers to guard against; but of all the dangers, this is the greatest; and I, if I were a Governor of one of the islands, I would keep out such Missionaries, as resolutely as I would keep out the plague. It appears to me that they must do mischief in many cases, and that they cannot possibly do good in any case whatever.

With respect to these religion mongers in the colonies; these religious friends of the Blacks, there is another observation to make, which is, that, of all the enemies of freedom in England, none have been so steady as these pretenders to religion. This should not be forgotten by the people of the whole kingdom. Names always do much; and the people of this country, naturally listen with attention and partiality to any one who professes to be the friend of freedom. We, who have been and are so oppressed ourselves, naturally incline towards those who express their detestation of oppression. Hence the "friends of the Blacks" have always met with a great deal of support amongst the friends of liberty at home, who have cordially joined them, in their hostility against the West India planters and merchants. I am, I believe, almost the only Reformer who has not, first or last, given his support, or, at least, his countenance, to these meddling hypocrites. Of late, indeed, the people of this country (and, perhaps, owing in some sort, to

my efforts) have been rather more cautious in this respect. It was high time to begin to be cautious, when we saw, that, without a single exception, every one of this band was a foe to our liberties. From boroughmongers and their immediate satellites, we had to expect hostility; from others, which I shall not now name, we had also to expect it; but the hostility the most strongly marked with malignity came from those who preached up the liberty of the Blacks as called for by religion. For forty years you have been making a figure as the friend of the freedom of the Blacks. During that time more than forty Acts of Parliament have been passed placing additional shackles upon the press. Game laws, trespass laws, laws taking away Trial by Jury, laws investing the Government with absolute powers to imprison; new Treason Laws; scores and scores of laws, inflicting the penalty of death, in cases which our forefathers considered not worthy of any punishment at all. These laws have been passed, and to every one of them there has been the hearty assent of every pretended friend of the Blacks, if he were in a situation to give such assent. The harder, the more severe the law, the better it seemed to please this description of persons. The nation is now staggering along under the consequences of a struggle against the liberties of White men; and those consequences it owes in no small degree to the pretended friends of the Blacks, who constantly made use of the reputation which they had acquired as advocates of freedom to second each successive

Minister in all his attacks upon freedom, and all his wars and expenses for the purpose of crushing it. It was curious to behold these friends of Black freedom, these lovers of liberty for Christ's sake, as they called it, always dropping in to *carry through the Minister at a dead lift*. I have no acquaintance with West India merchants and planters. I do not know that I have spoken to one, or even seen one, for more than eleven years. The West Indians, whom I was acquainted with, about twenty years ago and more, were principally French. If I had been acquainted with West Indians of late years, there are several things which I would have advised them to do, only a part of which, if done, would have prevented the present dangers to their property; but, there is one thing, which I advise them to do now; and that is, to get some one to give us a brief, nice, neat history of *your public life*; of all your workings as to the Slave Trade and slavery; of all your votes upon that subject; and, also, of all your votes with regard to measures *touching the liberties and lives of Englishmen*! A little work like this, the bulk of a little half-crown book, printed and distributed at the expense of the West India body, would, ultimately, save them millions. After all, there must be some sort of an appeal made to the people of England on this question. They cannot enter into the merits of the case in detail. The subject matter is at too great a distance. The people at large cannot be made acquainted with it all; but, if they were to see upon a few pages, the *whole of what you have*



done for them; if they could see how curiously it has happened that you could be standing up for the liberties of the Blacks, during every Administration, while you supported every Administration in Acts diminishing the liberties of the Whites; if they were to see this, the question, as far as they had any thing to do with it, would be settled. On one page they would see that, on such a day, you advocated the cause of the Negroes; and on another page they would see, on the day after, you advocated the cause of the Manchester Magistrates. There would need nothing more than this to enable the people of England to make up their minds upon the question. If they went further (which would not be necessary), they would find, at every step, a proof of the justice of their decision.

Leaving you now to hug yourself upon the effects of your cant about religion, let me ask you what you mean by the self-possession and *self-government*, which you say, the labourers in England possess. It is very easy to cant in this way. It is very easy to talk about being torn from dearest connexions, and sent into perpetual exile; but, as to self-possession and self-government now, do you pretend to be ignorant that thousands of men have been and will be again taken by press-gangs, put on board of ship, carried away from parents, wives, and children, flogged if they disobey the most trifling command, hanged if they mutiny or escape and are captured? Do you know nothing of other thousands upon thousands, who, under the name of militia-men, are forced from

their homes, parents, wives, and children, who are flogged if they refuse to stay, and, perhaps shot? Why, then, what becomes of your theory? What becomes of your pretences about self-possession and self-government?

You talk about the person being inviolate by any private authority, and the whip being in the hands of none but the public executioner. You are a gentleman of nice discrimination. For my part, I am not so nice, in this respect, and should care very little, whether the *Squire* laid the whip on himself, or had it done by his game-keeper or bailiff, or whether my back, were to have the honour of bleeding under the hand of a constable or a turnkey. The West India planter, seldom, I dare say, lays the lash on himself. You say that it is some robust Negro that is selected for the purpose. With us, in some cases, it is a series of drummers who perform the business, *ex officio*. They are the *public executioners*, to be sure; and this is, I suppose, the reason why we never heard of your coming forward, even with a single word, to assist in the abolishing of this mode of punishment.

But, you will say, it is for some offence that these whippings are inflicted upon the Whites. And you will take your oath to the contrary a great many times, before any man in England will believe that the Negroes are whipped for no offence at all; or, at least, without an *alleged* offence; and that is as far as we go in our knowledge as to the Whites that have the misfortune to get whipped. Talk not, therefore, to us of the *degradation* of the Blacks, until you let us see some effort of

yours to prevent the degradation of the Whites. You complain that the laws made to govern the Blacks, are made by *their masters* only. Are the laws which authorize the pressing, the drafting, and the flogging of the Whites made by those Whites? Or are they made by those whose lands and goods the pressed and drafted men are called forth to defend? Recollect, Sir, the hundreds of thousands of men that have been taken in this way, forced from their families and friends, sent to foreign lands, compelled to risk their lives in all manner of ways, and liable to the lash all the while, if they misbehave. I am not saying whether it be right or wrong to make use of this compulsion; but this I say, that I never heard of your saying that it was wrong; and that being the case, I have a right to question your sincerity, when you make matter of heavy complaint a degree of suffering on the part of the Blacks not a tenth part equal in amount.

Black degradation indeed! and the "*self-government*" and all the "*charities of the heart*," enjoyed by the labourers of England! What, then, you never saw Englishmen, "*English freemen*;" you never saw any of these at gravel-cart, actually drawing, like horses, two abreast, having the parish officer for a driver? You never saw English paupers at work in gangs? You never saw the pauper in Sussex at work with a *bill round his neck*? You never were at one of those auctions, perhaps, where the labourers are brought and *knocked down to the highest bidder*? How does this differ from the Negro sales in Jamaica?

There are two differences: the first is, that, in Jamaica and Virginia and Carolina, and other Black slave marts, the sales are in *fee*, or for a certain length of time; whereas, at the White auctions, they are never in fee, and only for a certain period. Another difference is, that the purchaser of the Black is interested in preserving his life and health, and is, therefore, likely to feed him and treat him well; whereas, the purchaser of the time of the White has no such interest in his life and health, and is, therefore, likely to give him as little food, and to get out of him as much work as he can.

In one part of your pamphlet you say, that to describe the conduct of the masters in the colonies and the state of the slaves in consequence of that conduct, is "*painful to me*;" but that it ought not, on that account, to be left out of view. It is painful to me, also, to make this exhibition of the state of the Whites in England; but I say with you, that it ought not, on that account, to be left out of view. Which do you choose, then, as a complete specimen of your "*English freeman*?" Is it the man carried away by the press-gangs? Is it the militia-man in the Isle of Ely? Is it the English freeman with a rope round his breast, drawing a gravel-cart? Is it the English freeman of Sussex, where, by the by, reside those WYNDHAMS who draw such immense sums from the Slave Colonies; is it the Sussex freeman, at work with a *bill about his neck*, being the fore one of the team, or the leader of the gang? Which of these is it you choose



for a specimen? Which of them is it that you select to hold up to the West India planters, by way of contrast? Or, will you have neither of these, and will you take the poor half-starved creature, with scarcely a rag upon his carcass, with his feet tied up in bits of sack, his legs twisted round with hay-bands; is it this wretched skeleton, standing trembling at the workhouse before the auctioneer; is it this poor soul actually perishing by inches with hunger, that you mean to produce, and, in your exulting humanity, bid the Planter of Jamaica bring up to a level with him; bring up to this state of "*moral dignity*," a fat and lazy Negro that laughs from morning to night!

I feel a degree of indignation that is impossible for me to express, when I see an Englishman thus dead to the sufferings, the indescribable sufferings, the real torments, of half the nation, while he flies to the West Indies to find out objects of compassion amongst a body of persons, who suffer less I verily believe, in body as well as in mind, than any other labourers of the same number, in any part of the world. It might become almost a question of sanity or of insanity, when speaking of the cause of a pamphlet like yours, at a time like this. You must have read, because we have all read, in the public papers, of a shipment, now actually making for *Buenos Ayres* from Ireland. Here is the real *White Slave Trade* going on, under your eyes! The slaves are, it is said, to be free, *at the end of seven years*, when they are to have some *land* allotted them! He must be a great impostor, indeed, who pretends to believe, that

it is not ten to one, that the whole of them will be dead before the seven years have expired. However, here is a people selling themselves into bondage: here is a transportation for seven years of hundreds of persons to avoid starvation in their own country, while that country is, at the same time, maintaining a great standing army within itself, and exporting immense quantities of provisions. You belong to the Legislature of this country. Can you find out nothing to change this state of things? Can you suggest no means of bettering the lot of these unhappy creatures, to watch over whose welfare you have voluntarily undertaken? You are not a Member of Parliament by compulsion. The Bramberites have not compelled you to serve in Parliament. You have, in fact, sought the office. It seems, therefore, natural enough to request you to find out some means of softening the slavery of the Irish people; of diminishing their wretchedness; of preventing them from fleeing from their native land, and selling themselves into bondage, under the burning sun of *Buenos Ayres*; it seems natural enough to expect you to do this before you undertake to correct the errors and supply the omissions of the Colonial Assemblies.

I could dwell much longer on this comparison between the states of the two sets of labourers, the Black and the White; but, not to make my letter too long, I shall content myself with noticing the two remarkable instances which you cite, of the cruelty of the laws relative to the Blacks, and of their ill treatment.

It has, from the very beginning, in or about the year 1785 or 1786; it has been the constant practice to exaggerate, in the most outrageous manner, whenever, the conduct of the masters, or the sufferings of the slaves were spoken of. One mode of exaggeration has been, to state, not what was in itself false, but to state it as something *frequently occurring*, when, perhaps, it never occurred but once. This is precisely what you have done here. You relate a story of the murder of a lately imported African in Barbadoes. The story is this: A Planter had bought a young Negro recently from Africa. The Negro wandered away, and got in amongst some canes belonging to another Planter; this Planter, in company with another, each having his gun, called to the Negro to come out. The Negro, in place of coming out, ran away, and hid in the cleft of a rock, he not understanding English, which, however, the Planters did not know. They could not get at him easily in this cleft; and, therefore, the barbarous wretches got some broken canes, set fire to them, and put them into the crevices of the rock behind him. The poor creature being burnt in this way, ran out of the cleft, and plunged into a pool of water close by. They sent a Negro to pull him out, and he threw a stone at the Negro, upon which the two White men fired at him several times, wounded him most dreadfully with their shot, while the Negroes pelted him with stones. The White savages ordered the Negroes to dig a grave, had him dragged out of the pool, and put

into the grave; and, you add, there seems to be some doubt whether he was then quite dead. You observe that the perpetrators deny this charge; but that, there is reason to believe it to be true.

Now, horrible as this story is, there can be little doubt of its truth, seeing that it was the subject of a letter from the Governor of the Colony to the Secretary of State, and the subject of a report from the Attorney-General of the Colony to the Governor. It is highly laudable to express one's indignation at so atrocious a deed, the perpetrators of which, ought to have been *named* in your pamphlet, that public execration might have reached them if they be still alive.

But, you do not seem to be aware of the danger of attempting to construe this into a proof of the *general cruelty of the Colonists*, or of the unfitness of the General Assemblies to make laws to govern the Negroes. You ask, in a triumphant tone; after having observed that the death, or, rather, the killing of the Negro, appear to have produced little indignation in the owner, except as it affected his own interest; after observing that the master, when he had reason to believe that a Negro had been killed, and not that it was his own slave, went away satisfied; after observing this, you ask, "Is there a human being, who, in this country, would have so done?" You are exulting too soon!

It is curious that the story says, that these two murdering Whites being informed, that there was a Negro *lurking* in the gully, went with loaded muskets and took several Negro men with them. Now



mark: not many weeks have passed over our heads, since the public prints informed us, that an Irish 'Squire, who was represented to be one of the most humane men in Ireland, shot a man, who was his own servant, and killed him, in his shrubbery. The story was this: The 'Squire saw or heard a man, *lurking* in his shrubbery. He called for his guns. A friend and some servants, ran out to him with the guns, and a hunt began after the "*lurking fellow*." By-and-by the 'Squire gets the glimpse of a running man. He takes him to be the "*lurking fellow*." He shoots him, kills him, and finds him to be his own servant. But what follows? Thus far the Barbadoes story and the Irish story bear a pretty strict resemblance. Here is not, in Ireland, the aggravated circumstance of putting a fire into the cleft of a rock. However, here is the most wanton destruction of human life. Here is a 'Squire shooting a man, with just as little ceremony as he would shoot a fox or a wolf, the only charge against the killed man being that he was *lurking* in the 'Squire's shrubbery. What followed, then, this killing of a man in Ireland? We have seen what followed the killing of the poor Negro in Barbadoes: we find the Attorney-General of the Colony, Mr. BEECLES, making a report to the Governor. We find the Governor, Lord SEAFORTH, writing to the Secretary of State on the subject, and expressing his horror and indignation at the act; we find the matter brought before the Colonial Assembly, and an Act we find proposed to be passed to prevent the like in future. This Act appears not to have passed but

still great indignation appears to have been excited towards the deed.

How different! alas! The feelings excited by the killing of the *lurking fellow* in Ireland. A Coroner's Inquest takes place upon the body of the servant that was killed; and the verdict is (hear it not ye Colonial Assemblies!); the verdict is "ACCIDENTAL DEATH, being killed in *mistake for the lurking fellow*." So that, if it had been the lurking fellow himself, all of course would have been right! We have heard of no representations of this case from the Attorney-General to the Lord-Lieutenant. We have heard of no representation from the Lord-Lieutenant to the Secretary of State. The whole nation have read the horrible tale. It has been circulated through all the numerous newspapers; and, so far from having excited any portion of indignation, the statement has invariably been accompanied with a high eulogium on the gentleness and humanity of the 'Squire, who, according to his own statement, or, at any rate, according to the statement made in his behalf, killed a man because he was *lurking* in his shrubbery.

Thus you see, Sir, you should always look at home, before you look so very sharply abroad. You are, as I observed before, in consequence of your own voluntary offer, a legislator for the Irish nation. Would this "*lurking*" fellow, if alive, not have as good a claim to your protection as the "*lurking*" Negro of Barbadoes? Yet, and I beg leave to press this point, not a word have I ever heard you say, about these deeds in Ireland.

Now, as to the main point, as to the fitness or unfitness of the Assemblies to make laws for the government of the Negro slaves, what do we gather from these two cases, from these two instances of wanton barbarity? We gather this, that there are cruel men in both the countries; but we do not gather, that such deeds are frequent in either country. God knows the House of Commons wants reforming; but I am not so unjust as to suppose, that any considerable portion of the Members of that House, or, indeed, that any one of them would attempt to apologize for this barbarous act in Ireland. Yet I must do this: I must condemn this whole Parliament on account of this act; I must insist that the commission of this act proves the unfitness of the Parliament to make laws to govern the mass of the people, I must do this, or else it is impossible for me to draw the same conclusion with regard to the Assembly at Barbadoes.

The other topic, alluded to above, as so much dwelt on by you, and the last that I shall notice, is, that relating to the *laws of impunity* passed by the several Assemblies. You notice particularly a law of Barbadoes which says, that, "If any Negro or other slave, under punishment by his master, or by his order, for running away, or for any other crimes or misdemeanors towards his said master, *unfortunately shall suffer in life or member, which seldom happens, no persons whatever shall be liable to any fine therefore.*"

This appears to be a law perfectly horrible. Yet, as you wrote

your pamphlet within the present year, you ought to have recollected, that a soldier (and mark the similarity of situation), who had been a *servant to the officers of a regiment*, and who, while he was their servant, was charged with, and tried and flogged for, stealing something from them; that this soldier, according to the verdict of a *Coroner's Inquest*, suffered in *life*; that is to say, was killed by, or *died in consequence of, that flogging*. This is notorious. This happened last year. This happened in England. The facts were all stated in the whole of the public prints, in which the names of persons and places were stated, and in which all the evidence was detailed. A long Session of Parliament has passed since, without the slightest mention of the matter! Allow this to be proper; allow impunity to be necessary in a case like this; but, then, you will find it difficult, I believe, to show the inhumanity or the injustice of that impunity which you so much complain of.

As I said before, you are a person of extremely nice discrimination. It would seem, either that you have a back, or that you think others have, to think nothing of a whipping, unless it come from some one in a private capacity. But, a killing! you, surely cannot think, that death is at all sweetened by its coming from persons in authority. The Negro, if he die, in receiving his punishment for any crime or misdemeanor against his master, is to lose his life, without bringing punishment of any kind upon any one concerned in the act by which he loses his life. Now, Sir, in



the year 1819, and on the 24th December of that year, you assisted in passing an Act of Parliament, to take from the people of England the right which they and their forefathers had always up to that time enjoyed, of meeting publicly for the purpose of discussing questions relating to public matters. This Act authorizes Justices of the Peace to order any such Meetings to disperse. In case of their not dispersing, it authorizes the Justice and those under his command to seize those persons who do not disperse; after which comes the following clause: "And be it further enacted, that if the persons assembled at any Meeting or Assembly held contrary to the provisions of this Act, or any of them shall happen to be **KILLED, maimed or hurt**, in the dispersing or endeavouring to disperse, or in arresting or apprehending or detaining them, that every such Justice of the Peace, Sheriff, Under Sheriff, Mayor, High Constable, Petty Constable, or other Peace Officer, shall be *free, discharged and indemnified*, of, for or concerning the *killing, maiming or hurting* of any such person or persons!"

Need I say a word more? Need I again caution you against making such a dreadful outcry, against the Colonial Assemblies? You were present at the passing of this Act. The Parliamentary reports say that you spoke for and voted for, the passing of this Act. I do not blame you for so doing. I am to suppose that you acted agreeably to your conscience; but if I adopt that supposition, how am I to join you, in your imputa-

tions against the Colonial Assemblies? Are the lives of Englishmen less precious than the lives of the Blacks; or is there more danger in those Englishmen, whom you call so enlightened; is there more danger in their being permitted to meet for the purpose of petitioning those who call themselves their representatives; is there more danger in this than there is in suffering slaves to run away from their masters, or to commit other crimes or misdemeanors against them?

This Act of Assembly you do, however, seem to look upon as proof conclusive, against the Assemblies; and you say, indeed, that the "*bare statement of the fact, must shock every liberal mind.*" When you said this, you had, in all probability, forgotten the Act that I have just quoted. But had you not also forgotten the still more memorable affair of the 16th August? In that case, there was no law existing to prevent the meeting of the people. Several had been killed, and hundreds had been wounded, petitions were presented to the House of Commons, calling for inquiry into the conduct of those who had authorized the killing and wounding. The proposition was not to censure the conduct of any body, it was to inquire into the conduct of those, under whose orders, several lives were taken, and the maiming of about five hundred persons committed. So much killing and maiming, have, probably, not taken place, in any one of the West India Islands, for the last half century, as took place, at the Town of Manchester, on the single day of the sixteenth of August. Dreadful as was the

deed, no one was bold enough to call upon the House for censure on any one. It was humbly prayed, to inquire, into the circumstances of killing and wounding so many persons. The House refused to inquire. The report says that you were one of those who strongly pressed it to give that refusal; and this the reporter gives us as the reason, for your conduct upon that occasion:

"With respect to the transactions  
"at Manchester on the 16th August, he (Mr. WILBERFORCE),  
"felt as deeply concerned at the  
"circumstances of that unfortunate day as any gentleman possibly could; but, if he asked  
"himself *how the peace of the country* was to be preserved,  
"the answer must be, that if the  
"House assented to any such  
"motion as the present, and thus  
"sanctioned the proceedings of  
"those bad men, who wished to  
"produce anarchy and confusion,  
"it would be the means of creating more discord and bloodshed, than any other measure  
"that could possibly be devised!"

Curious logic! How would the proceedings of the *bad men* be sanctioned by merely inquiring into the conduct of the parties! However, it is not my business, at present, to dwell upon this, and these words, might, in fact, not be yours. Still, it is certain, that you opposed the inquiry; and there can be little doubt that you did it upon the ground stated in this report; namely, that if inquiry were gone into; if the House, even so far as that seemed to lean with the Reformers, with the enemies of all abominable corruption and seat-selling; if the House went only that far; went

only so far as to inquire, it would be the *means of creating discord and bloodshed*.

Say, then, that this was all right: say that this was agreeable to your conscience; say, if you please, that *humanity* dictated the speech and the vote. But, do not rail, then, against the Colonial Assemblies, because they will suffer no punishment to be inflicted on masters, who chance to kill their slaves, while punishing them for crimes or misdemeanors. We say that the people at Manchester had committed no crime, nor misdemeanor; we say that they were only exercising a right, always heretofore exercised by their forefathers and themselves. They were not brought together, at any rate, to be punished for crimes and misdemeanors. If, in the actual commission of a crime, was their punishment to be death or maiming? After all, inquiry only was asked for, as to the cause of shedding so much human blood; and you, who were against that inquiry, lest the seeming indulgence should lead to confusion and bloodshed, now speak with horror of the Assembly at Barbadoes because it does not punish (not inquire into, mind), but because it does not *punish*, the accidental killing or maiming of a Negro slave, while under punishment for acknowledged crimes or misdemeanors!

Here I should stop, being quite satisfied that nothing more is necessary to show the hollowness and insincerity, or the gross folly of all your allegations respecting the laws of the colonies and the treatment of the slaves; but, there is a view of this subject much more important than any



that you have chosen to take of it. The questions which you have raised, lie between master and slave; but you have left unnoticed the question which presents itself to every man of reflection; namely, whether these colonies shall remain to assist in preserving the power of England; or, whether they shall go to add to the power of the *United States, France and Russia*. It requires a much sounder head than that which is upon your shoulders, to determine whether the sum of human misery has been at all augmented by the carrying of Blacks from Africa to America. Being in America, it is a question not to be decided on in haste, whether even a gradual and what is called a safe manumission would be beneficial to the Blacks themselves. No just man will doubt of the propriety of giving as much security as possible to the Blacks; of making their lives as easy and comfortable as possible, consistent with the safety of the Whites and the peace of the community. But, when you talk of giving them their freedom; when you talk of making them members of a community of which the Whites make a part, the grossest of ignorance, or the worst species of insincerity, must be seated on your pen. In several of the States of North America, slavery has been abolished by law. The Negroes are as free as the Whites. I remember only one white woman, married, not to a black, but to a mulatto. If she had been notoriously infected with the plague, she could not have been more shunned by white people; and it is notorious, that the lowest creature of a white man will never condescend to sit him-

self down at the table with a black. If this be the case, thirty years after the abolition of slavery, and that, too, amongst a people so hospitable, so humane, and withal so little inclined to aristocratical pride and distinction, is it any thing short of downright madness, to think of mixing up the Blacks and Whites of Jamaica to form one common community of free-men?

The perverseness of that faction which has so long been basely seeking for popularity by hypocritical professions of compassion for the Blacks; this perverseness is proof against all reason and all facts. There can be no sincerity in this faction, or it must begin to doubt, and to grow cautious upon looking at the colonising project of the State of Pennsylvania. You affect not to know, that the State of Pennsylvania, has attempted to get rid of its free Blacks by inducing them to submit to be conveyed to Africa! The colony was actually begun, and it exists now, for any thing that I know to the contrary. Pennsylvania is the great hold of the friends of the Blacks; in Pennsylvania the Blacks have been freed. Scarcely a fiftieth part of Pennsylvania is, as yet, in a state worthy of being called cultivation. The lands and woods and rivers all call aloud for hands. Emigrants arrive from England, Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, and, above all, from Ireland. They are all received with open arms, each being looked upon as an addition to the riches of the State. Indeed, what can be so certain as that the owners of the land of a country, will rejoice at the arrival of hands and mouths in

that country? Yet, strange to relate, in this very State of Pennsylvania, large funds have been raised to induce the Blacks of that state to suffer themselves to be banished to Africa. Some have actually been banished thither; but the main body of the Blacks have protested against such banishment; and, if the Whites please, they would prefer staying to sleep by day and thief by night, in Pennsylvania, where they have given a practical illustration of their notions of liberty, by taking, when they please, the property of whomsoever they please, which is not too hot to be held, or too heavy to be carried.

In short, the man who is unconvinced by this state of things in Pennsylvania; the man who, with this example before his eyes, thinks that in our colonies there can exist a community of Whites and of free Blacks, is a man not to be reasoned with. Of what avail, then, the projects about educating the Blacks, to which it seems the Government itself has lent an ear? Will the teazings of Missionaries make the Blacks more happy, or repine less at their lot? Is it possible for any man of sense to believe that any thing like book learning can be given to the Blacks; that they can possibly be admitted to the enjoyment of civil rights, without which, nevertheless, it is madness to talk of education? The fact is, that the teachers will become the masters of the colonies; and, as in the case of St. Domingo, loss of the colonies, must be the consequence.

You disregard this loss. I do not. Sufficiently critical are the

foreign affairs of this country at this time, without voluntarily running into additional danger. The other day; only just three days ago, the Morning Chronicle told us, that the *importation of cotton from Buenos Ayres had been doubled*, since that country became *independent of Spain*. I beg you to mark this. Last night the Courier informs us, that the United States had, after all, **DECLINED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE INDEPENDENCE OF BUENOS AYRES!**

A hundred times over we have been assured that they had acknowledged that independence! But, you will say, what has this to do with the educating project in our West India Colonies? It has this to do with it, that it tends strongly to confirm my opinion as to the conduct of the United States with regard to the Spanish Colonies on the Maine; that, in spite of the soft and the silly boarding-school talk of your friend Mr. CANNING, at Liverpool, here is pretty nearly proof positive that the United States is now preparing to act in concurrence with France, Spain and Russia, with regard to those Spanish Colonies.

Back those Colonies will go, then, under the dominion of the Bourbons, or we must fight for it. Let which will take place of these two, in what a state shall we be with our West India islands shaken to their centre by the cabals and intrigues of popularity-hunting Saints and their representatives, those "*Christian Missionaries*," whose chief business, even according to your own statement, it will be to teach the Blacks that they are *greater favourites with God than their*



masters are, and that if they be beneath their masters in this world, they will be their *superiors* in the next; a doctrine which will naturally, and almost necessarily, produce, in the newly enlightened, a strong desire to *hasten* "a consummation so devoutly to be wished," and to take, on *this side* the grave, possession of power which so justly belongs to them.

Open rebellion the educating project must lead to; and such open rebellion, always *favoured*, observe, *by the United States*, must make our colonies, what St. Domingo now is. Plucked of those colonies, half a wing of England is gone; and though you may think nothing of that half wing, or of any thing that does not immediately bring chink to the Exchequer, the country is not, I trust, prepared to resign itself to be a mere mart for exchanges and loans and funds, dependant on the mercy of its neighbours, its sword rammed in its sheath, with the coward's resolution of never drawing it again. I trust the country is not, again to be cajoled; and that the humanity for which it is so justly famed, is not to be so perverted by base and artful men as to make it conducive to its own disgrace and ruin.

WM. COBBETT.

### STRAW PLAT.

My readers will hear with singular pleasure that the poor young man, the *cripple*, living in the village of BENENDEN, in Kent, whom I mentioned in the account of my ride into that county, has arrived at such perfection in the

plattling and knitting of straw, that he is now making bonnets, for ladies of rank, and I am told, at so high a price as *five pounds each*. A school is about to be established in the village, where he is to teach the children to perform this work. There is a young woman gone by the coach this day to Wettersham, near Tenterden in Kent, where a most worthy and public spirited man has provided a pretty large parcel of grass straw. She comes from the establishment of Messrs. COBBING, BARNETT and CLARKE, of Bury St. Edmund's. —She is to teach the children at Wettersham. Her wages are to be good, and she is to be boarded and lodged in a respectable manner, which, be it observed, is no more than what she deserves. She is only about eighteen or nineteen years old; and she is to teach plattling, knitting and the making up of bonnets. I said, at the beginning, that the people in Suffolk and Norfolk would take the lead in this valuable manufacture. They have done it; and it is really a great honour to the town of Bury St. Edmund's, that it is sending out teachers to instruct the rest of the country. —I have not room this week to put in the Advertisement of Messrs. Cobbing and Co. The Advertisement, however, I will observe, states that they *want apprentices!* We want nothing more than this to convince us that the thing is done! —I think it possible that the young man at BENENDEN may not, after all, go the readiest way about the knitting. And it must be wonderful, indeed, if he know how to join plat that is broken or cut asunder. If this should be

the case, and this poor cripple should be unable to go, or, rather, to be carried as far as WETTERSHAM, I am sure that the goodness of Mr. WOOD, at WETTERSHAM, will induce him to send the young woman over to BENENDEN, or to let her go over, if she should be sent for. It is merely ten minutes business to put him in the right way; and, I hope that no one, who has any thing to do in the promoting of this undertaking will suffer any narrow motive to prevail for one moment. There is to be a school at BENENDEN, and there will be somebody, I dare say, to make the young woman some little acknowledgment for her trouble.—Wonderful is the progress that has been made in this undertaking. It is spreading with almost the rapidity of light.—Mr. COBBING and his partners, ought to have the young women that they send out to teach, capable of going through the whole business, from the rough straw to the complete bonnet.—I would also advise them, not to sell their plat; but to have it made into bonnets, and not to think much about a sale of these till towards the latter end of February, and then to have them sold at one shop in London.—But now, comes the *provision for next year*, which it is time to think about.—The straw of grass seems to cost nothing; but it would be cheaper to raise the straw of wheat. The Italians sow, for this purpose, the *Spring* wheat, which the French call *Blé de Mars*. I believe there is none to be got in this country, though there used to be enough of it. I shall, however, go fully into this subject, in my next.

## AMERICAN TREES.

I HAVE no room for what I wanted to say upon this subject. I must, however, say, that the trees, all except the Locusts, Walnuts, and Hickorys (and Apple-trees, of course), ought to be planted nicely in rows to form a little *nursery* for a couple of years. The Locusts, which form the principal part of the trees, may be planted out at once, where they are to stand.—Gentlemen who have sent orders for trees, will be so good as to recollect, how unlikely it is that we should be very expert at the taking up and packing up of trees. They will be so good, therefore, as to have a *little patience with us*. Of one thing they may be well assured; and that is, that nothing shall be sent in a manner to receive injury. I never suffer the root of a tree to be exposed to the open air one minute. The moment I receive a tree, I lay it by the heels in fine earth, and tread the earth down upon it. If the roots get once *pretty well dried*, it costs the tree a year's growth; and, perhaps, it never perfectly recovers it. I know of no tree so *thoroughly hardy* as the Locust; but even that suffers and greatly suffers, from the drying of its roots.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To several Gentlemen who have written to me about trees, I will write as soon as I can, and, if I do not write, I beg them to be assured that it is solely from want of time, and not for want of inclination. Whenever they are disposed to be angry, on this account, let them reflect for one moment on what I have to do, or, rather, on what they see me do.—NEMO has my best thanks for his letter, and for his message, his letter shall be inserted next week.—A Gentleman



from Liverpool will go with the money to poor SWANN and his wife. I have his letter to say so; but I wish to give him some information before he goes, and I have not yet had time to write to him. He will receive my letter about next Wednesday, and SWANN may expect to see him about the Monday afterwards.—I mentioned some money received from Wales, for SWANN. It was thirty shillings; and I by all means wish to return it; because, as I said before, when the imprisonment of poor SWANN is terminated, I may think it right to call upon the Public again; and I think that the money which has now been so promptly and so generously subscribed, will be quite sufficient until the termination of the imprisonment.

### GROSSE'S ANTIQUITIES.

Two sets of this Work, as far as relates to England and Wales, have been received, in consequence of the request made in my last Register. No other gentleman, therefore, need trouble himself to send me that work. I shall keep these two, because two persons then can be at work at the same time. The fact is, I am getting together materials for a complete Gazetteer, or Dictionary of the Cities, Towns, Villages, and so forth of this Kingdom of England, Scotland and Ireland; and I mean to get from Mr. Grosse the means of pointing out the local situations of the several subjects of his very valuable book. We have no work of this sort that is worth one farthing; so that I cannot, at any rate, fall short of other people in this undertaking.—I feel that I dare not send out this paragraph without telling the Public, that the *French Grammar* is actually in the press, at last! But, let it be recollected, that such a botheration sort of a thing goes through the press but slowly.

### POSTSCRIPT.

THE Botanical names of my several Trees shall be given in the next Register. The Locust is one of the sorts of the Robinia (the name which the French gave to it), but the Americans give the name of Locust to only one of the sorts of the Robinia.—Once for all, let me say, that I would not accept of a plantation if any body would give it me, if the ground were not trenched.

### MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 29th November.

| Per Quarter. | s. | d. |
|--------------|----|----|
| Wheat .....  | 51 | 4  |
| Rye .....    | 31 | 10 |
| Barley ..... | 28 | 8  |
| Oats .....   | 21 | 0  |
| Beans .....  | 37 | 3  |
| Peas .....   | 34 | 9  |

Price of FLOUR, per sack of five bushels, or 280 lbs.—Monday.

|                                       |              |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Fine English or Household Flour ..... | 45s. to 50s. |
| Second ditto .....                    | 40s. — 45s.  |
| Norfolk and Stockton ..               | 38s. — 44s.  |
| West Country .....                    | 45s. — 50s.  |

Quarters of English Grain, &c. arrived Coastwise, from Dec. 1 to Dec. 6, inclusive.

|                 |             |     |
|-----------------|-------------|-----|
| Wheat.. 2,252   | Pease ..... | 746 |
| Barley... 1,762 | Tares.....  | —   |
| Malt..... 942   | Linseed.... | —   |
| Oats.... 1,877  | Rape .....  | —   |
| Rye..... —      | Brank.....  | —   |
| Beans.... 443   | Mustard.... | —   |

From Ireland.—Oats, 4,235 qrs.  
Flour.—Essex, 160; Kent, 870;  
Stockton, 720; Yarmouth, 2,332.—  
Total, 4,082 sacks.

*Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.*

Friday, Dec. 5.—Our supplies of Grain this week are very moderate. Fine Wheat and Malting Barley obtained last Monday's prices; the inferior sorts go off very slowly.—The Oat trade is dull, but not cheaper, for fine fresh Corn.—In Beans, Pease, and other articles, there is but little doing; prices may be quoted nearly the same as on last Monday.

Monday, Dec. 8.—Our arrivals of all kinds of Grain last week were very small.—This morning we had a tolerable supply of Wheat and Barley from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk.—Fine Wheat, both Old and New, was taken off by the millers at the early part of the market, at an advance of 1s. to 2s. per quarter on last Monday's prices; but there is no improvement in the sale of the inferior sorts.—Fine Malting Barley sold on much the same terms as last week; Grinding Barley was rather cheaper.—Beans and Pease met a better sale, at our last quoted prices.—The arrivals of English and Irish Oats being small, fine fresh Corn obtained last week's prices.

## COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

Dublin, Nov. 28.—White Wheat 22s. to 36s.; Red 22s. to 36s. per barrel of 20 stone.—Oats 10s. to 13s. per barrel of 14 stone.—Barley 17s. to 19s. per barrel of 16 stone.—Flour 20s. to 22s. per cwt.

Edinburgh, Dec. 3.—We had a middling supply of Wheat to-day, and a small one of all other kinds of grain. Wheat 33s. to 35s.—Barley 20s. to 25s. 6d.—Oats 17s. 6d. to 22s.—Pease 19s. to 21s.—Beans 19s. to 21s. per boll.

Glasgow, Nov. 27.—Our Corn market continues brisk, and considerable business has been done at our quotations. Wheat 23s. to 32s.

—Oats 15s. to 21s.—Barley 22s. to 30s.—Beans 22s. to 25s.—Pease 21s. to 23s. per boll.

Liverpool, Dec. 2.—There has been a considerable falling off in the import of all descriptions of Grain since last Tuesday, nor has there been much doing in any article during that period. At to-day's market, which was not well attended by dealers, only the middling qualities of old Irish Wheat was saleable, and it barely maintained its price. New was very heavy sale, and somewhat lower. Barley continues scarce, and grinding is much wanted. The stock of old Oats is getting low; they, as well as Beans and Malt, support our former quotations. New Oats found few buyers, and were full  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel lower, and Flour 2s. per pack. Oatmeal maintaining its price.—Wheat, English, 7s. 6d. to 9s. 9d. Ditto, Scotch, 8s. 6d. to 9s. 6d. Ditto, Irish, 7s. to 8s. 3d. per 70 lbs.—Barley, English, 4s. 9d. to 5s. 3d. per 36 quarts. Ditto, Irish, 4s. 6d. to 4s. 9d. per 60 lbs.—Oats, Potatoc (Irish) 3s. to 3s. 4d. per 45 lbs.—Malt 7s. 9d. to 9s. per 36 quarts.—Beans 37s. to 43s. per quarter.—Superfine Flour 41s. to 46s. per 240 lbs.

Leeds, Dec. 2.—There has been a better supply of new Wheat at market to-day, also a larger supply of Barley, and the supply of Oats has been fully adequate to the demand.—Beans and Pease come sparingly to market. Fine new and old Wheat has not varied in price, but the middling and inferior has been 1s. per quarter lower. Barley full 2s. per quarter lower, and at that reduction few sales have been effected. Oats  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per stone lower. Shelling 6d. per load lower. In other articles no alternation.

Hull, Dec. 2.—We had a limited supply of Grain last Tuesday, consequently the trade dull. Old Oats and Barley are scarce, and conti-



nue in request. New Oats and Barley did not meet free sale; the former scarcely supported prices of last week, and the latter was 1s. to 2s. per quarter cheaper. The stocks of old Corn in granary have materially diminished during the last month. Flour as last week. Wheat 44s. to 52s.—Barley 26s. to 31s.—Beans 39s. to 41s.—Oats, old, 22s. to 26s. Ditto new, 16s. to 22s.—Tares 46s. to 50s.—Pease, boiling, 38s. to 42s. per quarter.—Fine Flour 42s. to 45s. Second 37s. to 40s. per bag of 20 stone.

Wakefield, Dec. 5.—Owing to the late stormy weather, our arrivals are not so great as they otherwise would have been; and having a good attendance of buyers, fine new and old Wheats are ready sales at an advance of full 1s. per quarter each; no alteration in inferior samples.—The supply of Malting Barley being again large, the trade has ruled dull at a decline of 1s. to 2s. per quarter; in Grinding Barley no alteration.—Beans are scarce, at an advance of 1s. per quarter.—In Oats, Shelling, Malt, Flour, and Rape-seed, no alteration.—Old Wheat 48s. to 64s. per quarter. New ditto, South Country, 50s. to 54s. per 60 lbs. 54s. to 58s. per 61 lbs. per bushel. Ditto, Yorkshire and Lincolnshire 48s. to 52s. per 60 lbs.—Meal Oats 12d. to 12½d. per stone of 14 lbs.—Shelling 31s. 6d. to 32s. per load of 261 lbs.—Barley, South, 31s. to 32s. Ditto, Lincolnshire, 28s. to 30s. Ditto, Yorkshire Wolds, 28s. to 30s.—Old and New Beans 42s. to 44s. per bushel of 63 lbs.—Maple Peas 38s. to 40s.—Flour 48s. to 50s. per sack of 280 lbs.

Norwich, Dec. 6.—Fine Wheat was in demand to-day at full as good price as last week; best dry samples readily obtained 50s. to 52s. Damp and ordinary, dull sale. Barley, a good supply; sale of the best not so free as preceding week at 26s. to 28s. per quarter.

Darlington, Dec. 3.—At our market on Monday last, we had a considerable supply of Wheat and other grain; prices steady. Old White Wheat 16s. New ditto 13s. 6d. to 14s. 6d. Old Red Wheat 15s. New ditto 11s. to 13s. 6d.—New Oats 5s. 4d. to 6s. Old ditto 8s.—Beans 10s. to 11s. 6d.—Peas 7s. 6d. to 8s.—Barley 7s. to 8s. per boll.]

Lincoln, Dec. 2.—New Wheat 44s. to 56s.—Oats 20s. to 21s.—Barley 29s. to 33s. per quarter.

Ipswich, Dec. 6.—At our market to-day we had a large supply of Wheat, but fine samples obtained last week's prices. Barley was a trifle lower.—Prices as follow:—Old Wheat 50s. to 60s. New ditto 45s. to 55s.—Barley 22s. to 39s.—Beans 31s. to 33s.—Peas 30s.—Oats 20s. to 24s. per quarter.

Yarmouth, Dec. 6.—The supply of grain was rather small for this season of the year, still it was equal to the demand. Fine Wheats were taken off on full as good terms as last week, but the inferior were a dull sale and cheaper. Malting Barleys were 1s. per quarter, and the second 1s. to 2s. per quarter cheaper. Oats were 1s. per quarter cheaper. In Beans and Peas note no alteration from last week. Prices as follow:—Old White Wheat 50s. to 55s. Ditto New 46s. to 50s. Ditto Old Red 48s. to 52s. Ditto New 44s. to 50s.—Malting Barley 25s. to 28s.—White Peas 36s. to 40s. Ditto Grey 27s. to 29s.—Oats 20s. to 23s.—Beans 28s. to 30s.—Flour 40s. per sack.

Northampton, Dec. 6.—Old Wheat 48s. to 52s. New ditto 44s. to 47s.—New Barley 22s. to 27s.—New Oats 19s. to 23s.—Old Beans 34s. to 38s. per quarter.

Mansfield, Dec. 4.—Wheat 18s. to 21s.—Rye 7s. to 8s. 6d.—Peas 10s. to 12s.—Beans 13s. to 14s. per load.—Barley 27s. to 33s.—Oats 19s. to 26s. per quarter.

**Derby, Dec. 4.**—Wheat 50s. to 56s.—Beans 40s. to 42s.—Oats 22s. to 25s.—Barley 32s. to 38s. per quarter.

**Chesterfield, Dec. 4.**—Wheat 38s. to 54s.—Oats 18s. to 20s.—Barley 30s. to 32s.—Beans 40s. to 44s. per quarter.

**Lynn, Dec. 4.**—We had a very dull market on Tuesday. Wheat of the best quality supported our last week's prices; but all other sorts were 1s. to 2s. per quarter lower. Barley may also be noted at a decline of 1s. to 2s. per quarter. White and Grey Peas continue the same. Oats very few at market. Beans are 1s. per quarter dearer. Flour continues without alteration.—New Wheat 36s. to 43s.—Barley 22s. to 27s.—Oats 18s. to 21s.—Grey Peas 28s. to 30s.—Beans 36s. to 37s. per quarter.—Fine Flour 42s. per sack of 280 lbs.

**Boston, Dec. 3.**—We had a small supply of Wheat to-day: prices, Old 50s. to 52s. New 45s. to 50s.—Oats (a good supply) 16s. to 21s.—Old Beans 36s. to 38s. New ditto 25s. to 28s.—Rye 26s. per quarter.

City, 10 December 1823.

**BACON.**—The demand for Bacon is very inconsiderable, owing, probably, to the excellent quality of the pork, of which a great deal is now sent to this market from the port of Belfast. Only a few years ago it was impossible to make any one believe that *Irish pork* could be manufactured so as to equal the Scotch or Yorkshire: it has, however, been brought to such perfection as almost to supersede the use of both in this market; and the trade is in the hands of men of great spirit and enterprise.—Bacon, on board, 44s. to 45s.; landed, 50s. to 52s.—Pork, landed, 50s. to 52s.

**BUTTER.**—This article is still advancing, and is scarce: *high price*, however, will make it hold out, unless we have another such a winter as the last.—On board: Carlow 90s. to 94s.—Belfast 82s. to 90s.—Dublin 84s. to 86s.—Waterford 82s. to 84s.—Landed: Carlow 88s. to 92s.—Dublin 84s.—Waterford 82s. to 84s.—Cork 80s. to 82s.—Limerick 80s.

**CHEESE.**—Every kind of *old Cheese* is scarce; consequently the *new* is consumed earlier than usual. Prices are advancing.—Fine old Cheshire 80s. to 86s.; Good ditto 66s. to 74s.—Fine old Cheddar 90s.—New Cheshire 56s. to 65s.—Double Gloucester 58s. to 64s.; Single ditto 50s. to 60s.

**Price of Bread.**—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at from 7d. to 9d.

**SMITHFIELD, Monday, Dec. 8.**

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).*

|              | s. | d. | s. | d.  |
|--------------|----|----|----|-----|
| Beef .....   | 3  | 4  | to | 4 4 |
| Mutton ..... | 3  | 8  | —  | 4 4 |
| Veal .....   | 4  | 4  | —  | 5 6 |
| Pork .....   | 4  | 0  | —  | 5 4 |

|             |       |            |        |
|-------------|-------|------------|--------|
| Beasts ...  | 3,448 | Sheep ...  | 19,160 |
| Calves .... | 240   | Pigs ..... | 290    |

**NEWGATE (same day).**

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).*

|              | s. | d. | s. | d.  |
|--------------|----|----|----|-----|
| Beef .....   | 2  | 0  | to | 3 0 |
| Mutton ..... | 2  | 4  | —  | 3 4 |
| Veal .....   | 2  | 8  | —  | 4 8 |
| Pork .....   | 2  | 4  | —  | 4 8 |

**LEADENHALL (same day).**

*Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).*

|              | s. | d. | s. | d.  |
|--------------|----|----|----|-----|
| Beef .....   | 2  | 0  | to | 3 0 |
| Mutton ..... | 2  | 4  | —  | 3 4 |
| Veal .....   | 2  | 8  | —  | 4 8 |
| Pork .....   | 2  | 4  | —  | 4 8 |